Turban and *türban:* "Divider between belief and unbelief". A political history of modern Turkish costume

(3 Tables, 7 figures)

KLAUS KREISER

Lehrstuhl für Türkische Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur, Otto-Friedrichs-Universität Bamberg. 95047 Bamberg. Germany. E-mail: Klaus.kreiser@split.uni-bamberg.de

There is probably no other country like Turkey whose inhabitants succumbed so thoroughly to state interventions as to how to cover or uncover their heads and hair. Suppression and enforced alterations characterize the last two centuries. The headscarf has become an important topic for the Turkish press since the 1950es.To-day the headscarf plays a major role in the discussion about the "maturity" of Turkey to become a member of the European Union. In the Turkey of the old days most rules on dress concerned religious minorities. When Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839) introduced the fez for soldiers and state employees, for the first time a large group of Muslim men had to respect a stricter regulation. The abolishment of the fez and the "introduction" of the hat almost exactly 100 years later (1925) had deeper socio-psychological effects. The liberalization instigated by Turgut Özal after 1982 did not lead to the reappearance of the fez (which was reduced to a symbol in the service of folklore or tourism), although there was a very limited renaissance of the turban. It is the ongoing ban of the female headscarf from public education, which is a permanent source of conflict in contemporary Turkey. The headscarf itself was never the target of state persecution in the early Kemalist period and later, whereas the face veil prompted some regulations on the municipal level. Meanwhile the secularized west with its anti-clerical heritage is equally restricting the use of the *foulard* for schoolgirls (France) and teachers (some German Länder).

The political story of Turkish dress and vestments is less difficult to survey as it may appear. But it is useful to know for a better understanding a number of words and things and their arrangement in time and space. Schematically there are three "archaeological layers" with the principal male headgear as "index fossils":

Table 1: A three-period system for Turkish male headgear

Time	***Period***
1925-	3. The introduction of the hat with brim
1826-1925	2. The Fez Century
Before 1825	1. The Age of the Turban

The Ottoman *Ancien Régime* (before 1826)

In the Ottoman Empire the state undertook the designation of theologians and jurists and controlled their function. As part of the centralized organization the *ulema* played also a decisive role in the application of the Islamic dress code. Collections of legal

opinions (*fetvas*) reflect what the Ottoman muftis, particularly the prominent Sheikhülislams, thought on garment. The respective chapters of their collections of case law include also advice on general appearance such as the treatment of hair and beard.

In the "classical period" of the Empire (ca. 16-18th c.) the muftis have often been asked for reliable advice with regard to luxurious textiles, since costumes of pure silk were not lawful for men. The use of silk and that of precious metals such as gold and silver in girdles was clearly forbidden for the male sex. A prominent Sheikhülslam though had no objections to the use of silk in woven quilts and mattresses. The coloring of the beard with henna and other substances was considered blameworthy yet lawful. A beard shorter than the canonically length of four fingers was a departure from the practices and rules derived from the Prophet Muhammad and his companions.
The amazing variety of headgear of officials, religious specialists and men in arms – not considering people without rank and file -, urban dwellers and peasants, and their regional types between Albania and the Persian Gulf had one common denominator: All Muslim men covered their shaven heads with a round cap (*arakiye*) and wound some yards of cotton cloth around it. Regulations of the female costume in the pre-modern period are not as sophisticated, the complete veiling (*tesettür*) being self-understanding. Most *fetvas* on women concern their limits of mobility and the status of female slaves.

The Muslim dress code was inseparably connected with the discrimination of minorities. Whereas the muftis put relatively few stipulations for Muslims, they set up a very detailed rules for Armenians, Greeks and Jews. They had to use for example hats, gowns and footwear in different colors. Muslims were strictly forbidden to wear the garments of unbelievers even risking their personal safety when they had to pass countries outside the dominion of Islam. Abolition of these differences would have been equivalent with the termination of the visible superiority of the Muslims over the Christian and Jewish population.

The Fez century (1828-1925)

The Fez-age separates Turkish history as a perfectly distinct stratum from the "age of the wound turban" and the "hat age". In the former and the latter period the types of dress and vestments followed universal applications - in the World of Islam and the Western world respectively. In the century between 1828 and 1925" the fez became a distinctive marker of the gradually developing Ottoman "nation". Thus, *Osmanlı* was no longer a term for the extended household of the sultan or the Turkish-Muslim elite as in the classical period, but rather designated an undifferentiated Ottoman subjecthood which separated the Ottomans from other Muslim "nations".

Figure 1. Turban and Fez

The introduction of the red brimless fez and trousers in the 1820es for the reformed troops which replaced the disloyal Janissaries did at first not lead to a complete uniformity of male headgear. Only servants of the state were forced to put on a cap without more or less complicated windings. Men of religion continued to wear their

turbans which were called *tac* in the case of members of brotherhoods. The *tac* displayed a greater diversity of material, shape and color and a higher symbolic value than the headgear of other social groups.

1828

At the beginning, the fez was despised by the conservatives who identified it with the headgear of Greeks and other unbelievers from the Balkans. Indeed, the fez owed its name and origin to the Maghreb. It was imported from Tunis at a time when this distant province was only nominally considered part of an already decaying empire, which Fuad Pasha called later euphemistically *États Unis de la Turquie*.

Nevertheless, the establishment of the fez was a success story. From Mahmud II. to Mehmed VI. (1918-1922) all sovereigns wore it proudly and without exception. A regulation dated April 1829 distinguished between a fez set with jewels for the padishah, embroidered fez for the pashas and viziers etc. The lower ranks wore the unadorned “ordinary fez”. The shape and diameter varied slightly: Sultan Abdülaziz (1855-1876), who tended to stoutness, gave his name to the broad Aziziye fez. The difference between the shape and color of the fez allows to discriminate finer strata of the “fez age”. In the days of Abdülhamid II. (1876-1909) the fez was the undisputed marker of a progressive *Osmanlılık* (being an Ottoman). Its conspicuous form and color made Ottomans easily perceptibly not only in the streets but also on the official oil paintings which were commissioned after the peace treaties of Paris (1856) and Berlin (1878).

The fez was worn by the children in the mushrooming state schools, modest scribes in bureaus, military and civil pashas, and ambassadors. Foreigners in Ottoman service had to wear the fez at work. This rule was indiscriminatingly applied to the officers of the Polish detachment in the Crimean war, Italian Court Musicians and Painters (Donizetti Pasha, Zonaro), and the German Professors, who reformed the University of Istanbul during World War I.

At the beginning of the Fez Century imports from Tunisia were indispensable, street sellers from North Africa distributed the fez in the markets of Istanbul. But the rising demand soon led to an Ottoman mass production. Between 1848 and 1850 more than 400 000 fez were produced. Like the turban the fez had a privileged place in Ottoman houses: The *kavukluk*, a wooden stand which hang in a corner of the private apartment. It goes without saying that the fez like the turban was never lifted for salutation or as a sign of respect.

Whereas the *Fezhane* (a huge building complex at the Golden Horn, which was unfortunately pulled down in 1986) continued the fabrication of affordable headgear a more ambitious clientele preferred imports from Bohemia. After the formal annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria-Hungaria in 1908 a successful boycott of Austrian goods was organized. In the first place, it was directed against the fez made-in-Bohemia. Efforts to replace the high quality product by local fabrications were only partly successful.

Boycotting imports from Bohemia

The counterrevolution of 1909 was supported by a great number of turbaned hodjas and medrese students. Among their six principal demands was the restoration of the Holy law (*şeriat)*, which presumably included the return to a stricter form of Islamic dress. After 1909, the fez was slowly replaced by the *kalpak* as a national symbol. Together with the *kabalak*, another military headgear, it became the "hall mark" of Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) and other military commanders in the wars between 1911 and 1922. German and Austrian officers in Ottoman service wore the *kalpak* as well. Ottoman diplomats and travelers going to Europe or America used to change the fez to the hat as soon as their train crossed the border of Bulgaria or Serbia. Officers trained in the Prussian army returned with a moustache à la Wilhelm II. causing the contempt of their comrades who had not graduated from a foreign military school.

For the tourists who arrived in growing numbers in the pre-war Ottoman capital the Muslim cemeteries were the only place where they could still study the original diversity of the Ottoman world: "The rank and condition of the deceased are distinguished by the size of the turban; and its form often indicates the period at which he lived", remarks the author of Murray's "Handbook for Travellers" (1893) quite correctly. European artists had since long finished to illustrate travelogues with different costumes. Dervish caps and turbans entered western museums and collections.

In the late 19th century some members of the Ottoman elite became aware of the rich diversity of local garments. The government proudly produced a luxuriously prepared costume album for the Vienna Exhibition of 1873. The photographs taken in ateliers displayed many regional variants - men and women, Muslims and Christians, shepherds, peasants and urban dwellers almost anticipating Turgut Özals (1927-1993) description of Turkey as a mosaic of 72 different ethnic groups.

What made the fez age particularly remarkable is the abrupt introduction and the relatively quick acceptance of this unusual headgear. Compared with the enforcement of the brim hat after 1925 the absence of any "ideological" justification is surprising. Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) on the other hand did not introduce a practical headgear for officials and soldiers in order to make his new order more visible, but to underline that a whole people is on the right track to contemporary civilization.

The introduction of the hat and the persistence of the veil: A cultural revolution?

During the Young Turkish decade (1908-1918) the westernization of institutions culminated. This short period is rightfully coined as a laboratory of the unborn Republic. Lifestyle was modernized in Istanbul and other great cities of the shrinking empire. Although the way of living of Muslim women was still very different from their Christian and Jewish sisters their traditional mode of dressing changed rapidly.

Figure 2. Çarşaf

After the war the sultan tried to preserve the dynasty and fought against the nationalist counter government in Ankara. Between 1919 and 1922 different cabinets in Istanbul enacted laws and orders which abolished the Young Turkish legislation.

Muslim women “were (once again) admonished to ‘dress modestly’ and cover themselves with the *çarşaf*. A special committee was appointed by the government to determine the exact shape and color of costumes which women could wear when they appeared outside their homes.” [1]These attempts were partly a reaction to the inundation of the old Ottoman capital by Russian refugees. The headgear of Russian women (*rusbaşı*) became the fashion of the time. Of particular interest is an order of the Council of Ministers dated 22 June 1920 saying that women were specially forbidden to wear European-style dresses, coats, and hats. This formulation seems to echo the *hadith* “When a Muslim imitates a non-Muslim, he risks assuming his belief”, although the cabinet did not try to regulate the costume of men. This issue of “imitation” is to play a major role a couple of years later.

A republican dress code

Immediately after the Peace Treaty of Lausanne (24. 7. 1923) and the proclamation of the Turkish Republic in Ankara (29. 10. 1923) radical judicial and cultural reforms pressed one another. In the eyes of Turkish contemporaries and the majority of foreign observers they were executed too radically and too hastily. But history has proven the sustainability of most measures. The enforcement of a new dress code needed no foreign expertise as it was in the case of the “Totalrezeption” of European law codes (1926) and the replacement of the Arab alphabet by Latin letters (1928), but it was not less courageous and risky. The orders and laws on the new dress code for officials and all Turkish males were enacted soon after the last public procession of the caliph, the abolition of the office of the Sheykhülislam, and the closing of the *medreses* (all in 1924).

Figure 3. Atatürk and Latife

Mustafa Kemal wanted to convince the totality of the Turkish population that the European headgear and costume were a precondition for entering the path to modernity. At the beginning, he chose a non-authoritarian, persuasive way. During the summer of 1925 he traveled to the provincial towns of Kastamonu und Daday with a sort of panama on his head. The Ghazi praised the hat not only as a civilized and practical thing offering protection from the sun, while at the same time being a cheap commodity. Returning to Ankara he was greeted by Rifat Efendi. This loyal mufti took the wound fez off and accompanied Mustafa Kemal bareheaded.

After an earlier order about the use of the top hat (*silindir*) and the tail-coat (*frak*) by state employees at official occasions, the “hat law” of 25.11. 1925 was regularly passed by the Great National Assembly. Despite the strict regulations enforced by the Law of Maintenance of Order two deputies opposed the hat law. Nureddin Pasha, a deputy of Bursa, argued that the dress code was in contradiction to the constitution and did not bind deputies who were not state employees.

It is typical for the political debate of the early Kemalist period that not only opponents but also advocates of the western dress code recurred to Islamic terms or even to the prophet Muhammad himself. For instance, the deputy of Antalya in the National Assembly, Rasih Efendi, cited as justification for the new mode a *hadith* saying that he prophet had worn a jacket (*ceket*) being a present from the Roman Emperor.

The decisive two-sentence paragraph of the law obliged officials in all sorts of public administrations and (vaguely) “institutions” to wear the hat (*şapka*), but its second part is phrased enigmatically: “The *şapka* is also the common headgear of the Turkish people, and the government forbids the continuation of any habit opposed to it.” Thus the Assembly did not explicitly prohibit the turban and the fez. The sentence on the “common headgear of the Turkish people” seems to anticipate the semi-totalitarian incorporation of the population in the 1930es. Yet, the hat was only accepted by a small minority. Although a that time the Ghazi was on the climax of his personal and political reputation, that the majority of the population met theses measures, as Eric Zürcher put it, “with stubborn resistance”.

On the other hand, it is certain that hats and caps were available soon at the cloth-sellers (*manifaturacılar*) in all provincial towns. State propaganda was anxious to combine a “Buy Turkish” campaign with the propaganda for European style headgear and suits.[2] This was not without contradiction, while the state had to allow generous credit lines for the new clothing of his employees. Incidentally some nationalist papers in Istanbul used the occasion to blame “non-Turkish” shop-owners for unjustified profiteering. The pro-Kemalist *Cumhuriyet* calculated the demand for turbans and came to the conclusion that the number of religious office holders who could claim a turban did not exceed 1 100 persons in Istanbul. Former makers of dervish caps should earn their living as haters.

Application and resistance

A major difficulty of the requirement of the hat was the necessity to uncover the head for salutation. In 1925 the Anatolian-Baghdad railway printed a small brochure on “Greeting with the hat”. The prominent publicist and engaged westernizer Ahmed Cevdet, who had written a pamphlet against the fez as early as 1912, published “Rules of Good Manners” as an introduction to European etiquettes in 1928.[3] Illustrations show the right way of salutation. A diplomatic incident was created by the Egyptian envoy who was asked to take off his *tarbush* at a reception in Ankara in 1931.

Serious resistance against western mimicry was put by Mehmed Atif Efendi of Iskilip, who had supported the Istanbul government during the War of Independence. He composed a slim book on the application of the hadith mentioned above. According to the learned theologian it was permitted to adopt objects deriving from western science and technology. Whoever dons a hat, though, declares that he does not belong to the Muslims. He concluded that anyone wearing a hat is not only an enemy of Islam but also an enemy of the nation and traitor to his fatherland.

Atif Hoca was condemned to death by a so called Independence Court and executed shortly thereafter (1926) although his text preceded the hat decree by over a year. Since 1975 this pamphlet and an earlier one on the “Canonical veiling of women” were reprinted with great success in Latin script. A particular success in the process of Islamic revival was the film of the Islamist director Mesut Uçakan on the martyrdom of Atif Hoca. It gained a big audience since 1993.[4]

A less known chapter in the history of Turkish dress code is that Edeb Servet (Tör), a devoted fellow combatant, was sent by Mustafa Kemal during the pilgrimage period of 1926 to Mecca. Edib Servet acted there as the president of the Turkish delegation

at the Islamic World Congress, which King Abd al-Aziz Ibn Saud had convened. Atatürk insisted that his delegate should appear in the holy city with an European hat. One contemporary pretends that the Ankara's envoy had gained respect and authority.[5] Whatever the truth is, as matter of fact many Turkish Muslims outside Turkey, for instance in Cyprus, where the fez was replaced in 1934 by "slouch hats", followed voluntarily Ankara's modernization measures. The influential politician Şükrü Kaya summarized the Kemalist point of view declaring that different societies with different national feelings could wear the same attire without risking to lose their identity.

Exceptions for the religious servants of all confessions do not mean that they were *exempted* from a special legislation. The *Imams* and *Hatips* (prayer-leaders and preachers) were allowed to wear their gown in office. Yet the Kemalist state was careful to standardize the "clerical" dress. Small derivations are possible though: In 2003 the newly appointed President of Religious Affairs Ali Bardakoğlu said to a journalist that he wanted to revive the robe worn by the Sheykhülislams and commissioned a garment in the ivory color of his Ottoman predecessors. This reference to an Ottoman institution is a good example how comfortably Turks deal to-day with the pre-republican past.

It is irritating that Atatürk who enforced the replacement of fez and turban by law did not wear the hat at every turn. There are, without doubt, a number of photographs showing him with a European brim hat, but the bulk of the documentation is without any headgear. The official iconography which started one year after the hat reform with the erection of monuments prefers standing figures or equestrian statues in military dress. After the death of the savior and ghazi (*halaskar gazi*) a Turkish sculptor represented Atatürk with his hat on his breast in a saluting gesture. The statue was erected in 1944 in the central Anatolian town of Çankırı, which had been visited by Mustafa Kemal shortly after the Kastamonu-Daday tour. Later examples of Atatürk greeting with a hat from an pedestal are rare.

The female dress

Did the Kemalists impose rules and regulations on the female dress? The answer is "Yes and No". Firstly, there is no national law prohibiting the veil or any other traditional costume. Some month before the inauguration of the Republic Mustafa Kemal declared at a speech in Konya (March 1923) that "it is out of question to make reforms in the way of women's clothing". Even though other declarations are less strict, it is nearly impossible to find support of European dress in the first years of the Republic. The radical atmosphere of the one-party period (1925-1946) changed things.

A proposal of the journalist Hakkı Tarik Us at the IV. Congress of the Republican People's Party (1935) for a legal prohibition of the scarf was not followed up, but a number of prohibitions can be registered against the *çarşaf* on the municipal level. Istanbul papers published respective notices from towns such as Adana, Afyon, Konya, Sungurlu, and Zile over the whole year 1935 –one year after Turkish women had been granted the right to vote. Like in other symbolic reform measures such as concerts and dancing parties the wives of provincial officials had to play the role of an avant-garde. In early 1937, the south-eastern Anatolian town of Maraş witnessed the putting off the veil of all spouses of officials.

For the overwhelming majority of women things did not change much, being illiterate and without access to radio they stayed out of touch with new ideas from Ankara. Period photographs depict mostly bourgeois families in European costume from the bigger cities and cannot be representative for the majority of the female population.

Figure 4. Two women at Taksim square

While the headscarf was widely tolerated, the face veil (*peçe*) had been a negative symbol and target of the reformers since the middle of the 1920es. The simple headscarf did not always cover the hair completely like the modern *türban* which had no predecessor in Islamic garment. When one of the most famous monuments of the early Republic was unveiled on Taksim square in 1928 the spectators could see on two sides medallions with female heads inside. The Turkish committee had commissioned these relieves as another illustration of the opposition Old : New which was propagated in these years. The western front of the Taksim monument shows a woman whose face is disguised behind a veil, the other side displays a cheerful young women without a veil but whose hair is covered by a head-scarf. The message of the relieves is simply: The liberation of women is connected with the removal of the veil.

Figure 5. Old and new

Kemalism after Mustafa Kemal

The laws and orders enacted between 1925 and 1935 remain unchanged until the present time. But there were some important additions to the Turkish dress code after the *coup d'état* of 12. September 1980. The new regime intended to bring the educational system under complete state control. In 1981, the Ministry of National Education and the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) prescribed in a 23 paragraph by-law the principles of the dress code for students of all levels. There was only one concession made to Islamic sensitivity: female students of the *Imam-Hatip liseleri* were allowed to cover their heads during the Koran lessons. The Presidency of Religious Affairs restricts its service of legal opinions on the internet to "frequently asked questions" in Turkish, Arabic, German and English without touching on the critical issues of women's clothing (http://www.diyanet.gov.tr).

What happened to the Act of 25. November 1925 "on the Wearing of Hats"? It is still part of the "Reform Laws", a sort of unchangeable annex to the Turkish Constitution (article 174) which had been left untouched by the important amendments made in 2001/2002. Consistently, the "hat code" also survived the alteration of the Penal Code. The former article 526/2 reappears as article 222 and prosecutes persons who "disobey an order issued for the protection of public order, provided that the order in question is given in a manner in conformity with laws and regulations" between two and six months imprisonment which in most cases is turned into a petty fine.

Despite the constitutional norms and the clear prohibition of the Penal Code thousands of turban bearers are visible in the streets and squares of the country in particular at the funerals of prominent sheikhs of sufi brotherhoods and neo-islamic communities. The pictures of the burial of Ustaosmanoğlu in 2004 shocked the readers of the Kemalist press.

In 2000, Professor Zekeriya Beyaz, dean of the Factuality of Divinity at a State University in Istanbul, published a book on “Islam and dress” with the subtitle “A Religious Solution for the Head Scarf Problem”. His analysis was a combination of religious, political and socio-psychological arguments culminating in a paragraph expressing that in Islam hair is neither holy nor cursed. Beyaz finished with the conciliatory message that he is not against the head scarf but against its political misuse. He sees in the encouragement of the Anatolian embroidered folk costumes a remedy for the battle against the danger of religious reaction. In January 2001 he was seriously wounded by the knife of a student during a conference on this topic.

Figure 6. Demirel at Isparta

In contrast to the extremely politicized *türban* issue there seems to be no remarkable incident concerning the violation of the hat law . But it must be remembered that the reaction of state officials is still very sharp when people try to enter official rooms, courthouses and school buildings in an outfit which is not conform with the republican traditions. Within these confines the state has won, but his effort to discipline and regulate the public space has been in vain.

Figure 7. Silk *turban* and Istanbul lads.

To sum up

Like real archeologists costume historians have to be prudent with hasty conclusions: Süleyman Demirel’s distinguishing accessory is the *fötr*. In contrast to his provincial, popular background he was never seen without tie and jacket, whereas the only important “leftist” PM during the history of the Turkish Republic, Bülent Ecevit, preferred the *kasket*, although his support in rural Turkey has always been restricted.

Atatürk has not systematically developed a political ideology, but one cannot not deny that there is such a thing as Kemalism or Atatürkçülük , in which a bundle of Western juridical norms, educational measures and symbolic innovations have been successfully tied up. The Kemalist revolutionaries did no fight against headgear and costumes alone, they also opposed street dogs, blind alleys, and wooden houses. They did not want to replace minarets by smokestacks, but rather concentrated on symbolic measures like replacing turbans by hats. Sartorial modernity *and* homogeneity of the whole country was an unspoken element of their political program. The contemporary conflict revolving around the “political” symbol of the headscarf could not have been predicted back in the 1930es. Female participation and the freedom of movement in the public space were more important achievements than dress regulations for women. The Kemalists were convinced that sooner or later the last traces of the Ottoman backwardness would disappear. It is somewhat irritating that we have to-day a co-existence in one family of the universal baseball cap for men and the *türban* which seems to be a candidate for the new index fossil for the Third Republic (1982-).

About the Author

Klaus Kreiser was Professor of Turkish Language, History and Civilization at Bamberg University. He is the author of numerous articles and books on Ottoman and modern Turkish history. His current research interest is in public monuments and memorials in the modern Islamic World. Since 2004 he is a section editor for the Encyclopedia of Islam.

Captions for figures follow

Table 2. The Chronology of state intervention

1826	Husrev Pasha orders the sailors to wear the fez.
1829	Civilians in state service have to put on the fez.
1830	Opening of the first fez manufactory (Feshane)
1873	Album *Les costumes populaire de la Turquie* for the Vienna Exhibition
1908	Fes boykot against Austria-Hungaria
1920	New dress codes for women by the Istanbul government
1924	İskilipli Atıf Hoca's treatise *The imitation of the Europeans and the hat*
1925	**24. 8**. **Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk's) in Kastamonu 27. 8. Şapka speech in İnebolu 2.9./11.10. Dress code for officials 25.11. Law on the requirement of the hat**
1926	Execution of İskilipli Atıf Hoca Islamic World Congress convened by Abd al-Aziz ibn Saud. The Turkish delegates wears a hat.
1931	Tarbush-incident with Egyptian envoy
1934	5.12. Regulation of the official attire for religious dignitaries in public
1935	Several provincial towns prohibit the scarf.
1936	4.12. 45 wearers of fez arrested in Istanbul Fatih
1956	The Presidency of Religious Affairs proposes to employ women with head scarf.
1981	**7.12.. Dress regulations of the Ministry for National Education and other schools**
1982	21. 1. Regulation extended to the Personal in the Public Service
1987	8.1. The Council for Higher Education (YÖK) issues a disciplinary code on "the requirement of contemporary dress and appearance" (abolished by the Constitutional court 1989
1993	3.5. The European Court of Human Rights decides against a Turkish student who was a diploma with a photograph showing her with *türban* .
2005	MPM Erdoğan still undecided about the use of the *türban* in school rooms. The French model – no headscarf at schools, liberalization or universities – is discussed.

Table 3. The vocabulary of costume. Some most frequently used terms

(Ottoman-)Turkish term	***English meaning***
arakiye	Soft felt cap worn under the *sarık*
çarşaf	Women's baggy outdoor garment
ferace	Over mantle
fes	Fez, red brimless hat
fötr	Felt hat (French: *feutre*)
kabalak	Military headgear worn in World War I
kalpak	Fur cap
kasket	Cloth cap belonging to villagers
peçe	Black face veil

sarık	Turban with skullcap as a foundation for the folds
şapka	Hat (Russian)
tac	Dervish headgear
tarsbush	Term for fez in Egypt and Syria
türban	Modern word derived from French, not the elaborately wound turban of former times (see *sarık*) but a scarf, covering a woman's hair more or less completely

Further Reading

C. Aktaş (1991); *Tanzimattan Günümüze Kılık Kıyafet ve İktidar* (Istanbul: Nehir).
Z. Beyaz (2000): *İslam ve Giyim Kuşam. Başörtüsü Sorununa Dini Çözüm,* 2.ed. (Istanbul: Sancak).
G. Jäschke (1951): *Der Islam in der neuen Türkei. Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Leiden: Brill).
Ş. Karlıklı, D. Tezan (1998): *Cumhuriyet kıyafetleri* (Istanbul: GSD Holding).
O. Koloğlu(1978): *İslamda Başlık* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).
A. Mango (1999): *The Biography of the Founder of Modern Turkey* (New York: Overlook).
J. M. Scarce (1987): *Women's costume of the Near and Middle East* (London Unwin Hyman).
St. Shaw (2000): *From Empire to Republic. The Turkish War of National Liberation 1918-1923. A Documentary Study* 5 Vol.
Z. Toprak (1994): Mütareke Yılında Istanbul, *in Dünden Bugüne İstabul Ansiklopedisi* Vol. 6, pp.19-23.
E. Krüger/R. Wielandt (1992): Kleidung, in: Kreiser, K. and R. Wielandt (edd.), *Lexikon der Islamischen Welt*, (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer) pp. 156-158.

[1] Shaw (2000) Vol. 2, 832.
[2] Compare the law on the use of local textiles for costumes (9.12.1925).
[3] Obviously translated from a French book.
[4] Martin Strohmeier (University of Cyprus) allowed me to use an unpublished text on Atif Efendi.
[5] Semih Tezcan (Bamberg University) draw my attention to the anecdotic recollections of Behçet Kemal Çağlar, *Atatürk Denizinden Damlalar*, Istanbul: Ak 1967.